



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/673,211

09/30/2003

Xavier Montagne

003921.00136

9597

22907

7590

11/27/2006

BANNER & WITCOFF
1001 G STREET N W.
SUITE 1100
WASHINGTON, DC 20001

EXAMINER

GANDHI, DIPAKKUMAR B

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2138

DATE MAILED: 11/27/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/673,211

Applicant(s)

MONTAGNE ET AL.

Examiner

Dipakkumar Gandhi

Art Unit

2138

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 September 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 21 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 and 22-25 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 30 September 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Response to Amendment

1. Applicants' request for reconsideration filed on 09/13/2006 has been reviewed.
2. Amendment filed on 09/13/2006 has been entered.
3. Applicants' arguments have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

4. The applicants contend, "As per claim 1, Farooq and Herron does not teach or suggest each and every feature of Applicants' claim 1 and there is no proper motivation for combining the two references."

The examiner disagrees and would like to point out that Farooq teaches a method for testing configurable logic blocks in an emulation system, the method comprising steps of: operating a first set to test a second set of configurable logic blocks (fig. 2, col. 3, lines 8-42, Farooq).

Herron et al. teach configuring a first set of configurable logic blocks to be first testing circuitry (fig. 9, 22, col. 3, lines 41-44, col. 14, lines 23-28, Herron et al.).

5. The applicants contend, "As per claim 13, Butts et al. and Cote et al. fail to teach configuring a second routing portion to map N inputs of the second routing portion to N outputs of the second routing portion in a second configuration inverse to the first configuration. "

The examiner disagrees and would like to point out that Butts et al. teach that an "interconnect chip" is an electronically reconfigurable device which can implement arbitrary interconnections among its I/O pins. A "routing chip" is an interconnect chip used in a direct or channel-routing interconnect (col. 2, lines 15-19, Butts et al.). Thus implementing arbitrary interconnections among the I/O pins comprise inverse configuration.

6. The applicants contend, "Claim 23 includes similar features as described above with reference to claim 13. As such, Applicants' claim 23 is patentably distinct over the art of record for at least similar reasons as described with respect to claim 13."

The examiner disagrees and would like to mention that claim 23 is rejected for similar reasons as described above with respect to claim 13.

Art Unit: 2138

7. The applicants contend, "As per claim 24, Tseng et al. and Cote et al. fail to teach that wherein the data processing portion is configured to provide a first test pattern to the first set to test the second set and a second test pattern to the second set to test the first set."

The examiner disagrees and would like to point out that Cote et al. teach that FIG. 3C shows another implementation... in the FPGA (fig. 3C, col. 25, lines 6-26, Cote et al.). Cote et al. also teach that it is within the contemplation of the invention to provide within computer-readable media (e.g., floppy diskettes, CD-ROM, DVD-ROM) and/or within manufactured and transmitted signals, FPGA-configuring bit streams in accordance with the above disclosure and/or to provide computer-understandable instructions to computers for causing the computers to perform automated stepping of FPGA's under-test through a battery of reconfigurations and test loops and readouts in accordance with the above disclosure (col. 27, lines 52-61, Cote et al.).

8. The applicants contend, "As per claim 25, none of the references teaches or suggests wherein the second routing portion is configured to map N inputs of the second routing portion to N outputs of the second routing porting in a second manner inverse to the first manner."

The examiner disagrees and would like to point out that Butts et al. teach that an "interconnect chip" is an electronically reconfigurable device which can implement arbitrary interconnections among its I/O pins. A "routing chip" is an interconnect chip used in a direct or channel-routing interconnect (col. 2, lines 15-19, Butts et al.). Thus implementing arbitrary interconnections among the I/O pins comprise inverse configuration.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 2138

10. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

11. Claims 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 9, 10, 11, 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Farooq (US 6,760,277 B1) in view of Herron et al. (US 6,996,758 B1).

As per claim 1, Farooq teaches a method for testing configurable logic blocks in an emulation system, the method comprising steps of: operating a first set to test a second set of configurable logic blocks (fig. 2, col. 3, lines 8-42, Farooq).

However Farooq does not explicitly teach the specific use of configuring a first set of configurable logic blocks to be first testing circuitry.

Herron et al. in an analogous art teach that the test circuitry includes interconnect circuitry and test logic circuitry formed within the interfacing logic portion of the FPGA (fig. 9, col. 3, lines 41-44, Herron et al.).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Farooq's patent with the teachings of Herron et al. by including an additional step of configuring a first set of configurable logic blocks to be first testing circuitry.

This modification would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, because one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that configuring a first set of configurable logic blocks to be first testing circuitry would provide the opportunity to configure the logic blocks to test other parts of the system.

- As per claim 2, Farooq and Herron et al. teach the additional limitations.

Herron et al. teach configuring the second set to be second testing circuitry (fig. 9, col. 3, lines 41-44, Herron et al.).

Farooq teaches operating the second set to test the first set (fig. 2, col. 3, lines 8-42, Farooq).

- As per claim 3, Farooq and Herron et al. teach the additional limitations.

Art Unit: 2138

Herron et al. teach configuring a third set of configurable logic blocks to be second testing circuitry (fig. 9, col. 3, lines 41-44, Herron et al.).

Farooq teaches operating the third set, concurrently with the first set, to test a fourth set of configurable logic blocks (fig. 2, col. 3, lines 8-42, Farooq).

- As per claim 4, Farooq and Herron et al. teach the additional limitations.

Herron et al. teach configuring the second set and the fourth set to be third testing circuitry and fourth testing circuitry, respectively (fig. 9, col. 3, lines 41-44, Herron et al.).

Farooq teaches operating the second set and the fourth set to test the first set and the third set, respectively (fig. 2, col. 3, lines 8-42, Farooq).

- As per claim 5, Farooq and Herron et al. teach the additional limitations.

Herron et al. teach the method, wherein the step of configuring the first set includes: configuring $N \geq 1$ configurable logic blocks of the first set to operate as an N-bit input generator; and coupling an output of the N-bit input generator to the configurable logic blocks of the second set (col. 2, line 58-col. 3, line 3, col. 11, lines 51-56, Herron et al.).

- As per claim 6, Farooq and Herron et al. teach the additional limitations.

Herron et al. teach the method, further comprising a step of configuring a configurable logic block of the first set to determine whether the N-bit input generator outputs a predetermined value (col. 13, lines 44-54, Herron et al.).

- As per claim 9, Farooq and Herron et al. teach the additional limitations.

Herron et al. teach the method, further comprising a step of configuring each configurable logic block of the second set to respond with a deterministic output to an N-bit input, wherein the step of configuring the first set includes configuring a configurable logic block of the first set as a verifier to verify a responsive output of the second set organized into M groups of configurable logic blocks (col. 3, line 57 to col. 4, line 3, col. 4, lines 26-32, Herron et al.).

- As per claim 10, Farooq and Herron et al. teach the additional limitations.

Art Unit: 2138

Herron et al. teach the method, wherein the verifier is configured to accept the N-bit input, and wherein each of the M groups includes N-1 configurable logic blocks configured to supply N-1 bits to the verifier (col. 4, lines 26-32, Herron et al.).

- As per claim 11, Farooq and Herron et al. teach the additional limitations.

Herron et al. teach the method, wherein the verifier is configured to accept its own output as one bit of the N-bit input (col. 4, lines 29-32, lines 38-40, lines 42-43, Herron et al.).

- As per claim 12, Farooq and Herron et al. teach the additional limitations.

Herron et al. teach the method; wherein the step of configuring the verifier includes configuring the verifier to deterministically output a failure indicator (col. 10, lines 23-26, col. 11, lines 18-20, col. 22, lines 24-26, Herron et al.).

12. Claims 7-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Farooq (US 6,760,277 B1) and Herron et al. (US 6,996,758 B1) as applied to claim 6 above, and further in view of Kattan (US 6,621,767 B1).

As per claim 7, Farooq and Herron et al. substantially teach the claimed invention described in claim 6 (as rejected above).

However Farooq and Herron et al. do not explicitly teach the specific use of the method wherein the step of configuring the $N \geq 1$ configurable logic blocks includes configuring the $N \geq 1$ configurable logic blocks to operate as an N-bit counter.

Kattan in an analogous art teaches a 37-bit counter 212 in the FPGA (col. 12, line 16, Kattan).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Farooq's patent with the teachings of Kattan by including an additional step of using the method wherein the step of configuring the $N \geq 1$ configurable logic blocks includes configuring the $N \geq 1$ configurable logic blocks to operate as an N-bit counter.

This modification would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, because one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that it would provide the opportunity to provide N-bit input to the second set of configurable logic blocks.

- As per claim 8, Farooq, Herron et al. and Kattan teach the additional limitations.

Art Unit: 2138

Kattan teaches the method, wherein the predetermined value is a maximum value of the N-bit counter (col. 12, line 16, Kattan).

13. Claims 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Butts et al. (US 5,036,473) in view of Cote et al. (US 6,470,485 B1).

As per claim 13, Butts et al. teach configuring a first routing portion to map N inputs of the first routing portion to N outputs of the first routing portion in a first configuration; configuring a second routing portion to map N inputs of the second routing portion to N outputs of the second routing portion in a second configuration inverse to the first configuration, the N inputs of the second routing portion configured to be coupled to the N outputs of the first routing portion; applying input data to the inputs of the first routing portion; and receiving output data from the output of the second routing portion, the output data being responsive to the input data (fig. 3, col. 2, lines 15-19, col. 11, lines 46-50, col. 12, lines 30-37, col. 13, lines 5-35, Butts et al.).

However Butts et al. do not explicitly teach the specific use of a method of testing routing portions in an emulation system.

Cote et al. in an analogous art teach that the ability of all parts of the interconnect within the IC...proper operation of the integrated circuit (col. 1, lines 59-64, Cote et al.). Cote et al. also teach that testing of interconnect resources...fully operational (col. 2, lines 16-27, Cote et al.). Cote et al. teach that a simulation model of the FPGA under-test is constructed with its logic blocks configured to implement sequencers such as shown in FIG. 2A (col. 13, lines 18-20, Cote et al.). Cote et al. teach to efficiently test all of the diversified interconnect resources of the FPGA embodiment 300 (fig. 3A, col. 18, lines 58-60, Cote et al.). Cote et al. teach test-enabling reconfigurations of the FPGA 300...interconnect is free of defects (col. 19, lines 28-60, Cote et al.).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Butts et al.'s patent with the teachings of Cote et al. by including an additional step of using the method of testing routing portions in an emulation system.

This modification would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, because one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that using the method of testing

Art Unit: 2138

routing portions in an emulation system would provide the opportunity to verify that all parts of the interconnect within the IC correctly and consistently route all signals in timely and accurate fashion between configurable logic blocks.

- As per claim 14, Butts et al. and Cote et al. teach the additional limitations.

Cote et al. teach the method, further comprising a step of determining whether a difference exists between the input data and the output data (fig. 3A, col. 19, lines 57-60, Cote et al.).

- As per claim 15, Butts et al. and Cote et al. teach the additional limitations.

Cote et al. teach the method, further comprising a step of configuring a first group of configurable logic blocks to perform the step of applying, wherein the configurable logic blocks include logic circuitry for implementing reprogrammable logic (fig. 1B, col. 5, lines 47-48, Cote et al.).

- As per claim 16, Butts et al. and Cote et al. teach the additional limitations.

Cote et al. teach the method, further comprising a step of configuring a second group of configurable logic blocks to perform the step of determining (col. 9, lines 44-46, Cote et al.).

- As per claim 17, Butts et al. and Cote et al. teach the additional limitations.

Cote et al. teach the method, wherein the N inputs of the second routing portion are configured to be coupled to the N outputs of the first routing portion through at least one reconfigurable interconnect (fig. 1B, col. 7, lines 2-8, Cote et al.).

- As per claim 23, Butts et al. and Cote et al. teach the additional limitations.

Butts et al. teach an integrated circuit, comprising: a first routing portion configured to map N inputs of the first routing portion to N outputs of the first routing portion in a first configuration, and configured to receive input data; a second routing portion configured to map N inputs of the second routing portion to N outputs of the second routing portion in a second configuration inverse to the first configuration, and configured to output data; wherein the N inputs of the second routing portion are coupled to the N outputs of the first routing portion (fig. 3, col. 2, lines 15-19, col. 11, lines 46-50, col. 12, lines 30-37, col. 13, lines 5-35, Butts et al.).

Cote et al. teach monitoring logic configured to determining whether a difference exists between the input data and the output data (fig. 3A, col. 19, lines 57-60, Cote et al.).

Art Unit: 2138

14. Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cote et al. (US 6,470,485 B1) in view of Lesea (US 6,874,107 B2).

As per claim 18, Cote et al. teach an integrated circuit, comprising: a first set of configurable logic blocks; a second set of configurable logic blocks, coupled to the first set; and a data processing portion coupled to the first set, the data processing portion configured to provide a first test pattern to the first set, wherein the first set is configured to provide a second test pattern to test the second set, and the second set is configured to output data in response to the second test pattern received from the first set, wherein the first set is further configured to provide an N-bit input generator to the second set (fig. 3B, 3C, 4A, 4B, col. 1, lines 10-13, col. 17, line 66 to col. 18, line 3, col. 23, lines 48-50, col. 24, lines 1-17, col. 25, lines 6-26, col. 25, lines 33-47, col. 26, lines 35-42, col. 27, lines 18-40, Cote et al.).

However Cote et al. do not explicitly teach specifically to provide a configurable logic block, separate from the N-bit input generator, as a verifier to verify the output data of the second set.

Lesea in an analogous art teaches that a field programmable gate array (FPGA) comprises input and output data communication connections, a serializer/deserializer circuit coupled to the input and output data communication connections, and a logic array programmed to generate a test data pattern coupled to the output data connection. The logic array is further programmed to check a data pattern received on the input connection while performing a built in self test operation (fig. 2, col. 2, lines 34-42, Lesea).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Cote et al.'s patent with the teachings of Lesea by including an additional step of providing a configurable logic block, separate from the N-bit input generator, as a verifier to verify the output data of the second set.

This modification would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, because one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that it would provide the opportunity to verify interconnect boards including integrated circuits so that the signals can be routed correctly.

- As per claim 19, Cote et al. and Lesea teach the additional limitations.

Cote et al. teach the integrated circuit, wherein the first set is further configured to compare the output data to predetermined output data (fig. 3C, col. 25, lines 6-26, Cote et al.).

Art Unit: 2138

- As per claim 20, Cote et al. and Lesea teach the additional limitations.

Cote et al. teach the integrated circuit, wherein the data processing portion is further configured to provide a third test pattern to the second set, the second set is further configured to provide a fourth test pattern to test the first set, and the first set is further configured to output second data in response to fourth test pattern received from the second set (fig. 3B, 3C, 4A, 4B, col. 23, lines 48-50, col. 24, lines 1-17, col. 25, lines 33-47, col. 26, lines 35-42, col. 27, lines 18-30, Cote et al.).

- As per claim 22, Cote et al. and Lesea teach the additional limitations.

Cote et al. teach the integrated circuit, wherein an output of the verifier is an input to the verifier, and wherein the output of the verifier is a failure indicator (fig. 3C, col. 25, lines 6-26, Cote et al.).

15. Claim 24 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tseng et al. (US 5,903,744) in view of Cote et al. (US 6,470,485 B1).

As per claim 24, Tseng et al. teach an emulation system, comprising: a plurality of emulation boards; and a plurality of interconnect boards interconnecting the plurality of emulation boards (fig. 1, col. 1, line 51-col. 2, line 16, Tseng et al.).

However Tseng et al. do not explicitly teach the specifically that each of the plurality of interconnect boards has an integrated circuit having first and second sets of configurable logic blocks and a data processing portion coupled to the first and second sets, wherein the data processing portion is configured to provide a first test pattern to the first set to test the second set and a second test pattern to the second set to test the first set.

Cote et al. in an analogous art teach that FIG. 3C shows another implementation...clock wires in the FPGA (fig. 3C, col. 25, lines 6-26, Cote et al.). Cote et al. also teach computerized testing system 400...packaged IC device (fig. 4A, col. 25, lines 34-47, Cote et al.). Cote et al. teach a method for interconnecting components...processors (fig. 4B, col. 26, lines 36-43, Cote et al.). Cote et al. teach FPGA configuring...test-result reports (col. 27, lines 19-40, Cote et al.). Cote et al. also teach that it is within the contemplation of the invention to provide within computer-readable media (e.g., floppy diskettes, CD-ROM, DVD-ROM) and/or within manufactured and transmitted signals, FPGA-configuring bit streams in accordance with the above disclosure and/or to provide computer-understandable

Art Unit: 2138

instructions to computers for causing the computers to perform automated stepping of FPGA's under-test through a battery of reconfigurations and test loops and readouts in accordance with the above disclosure (col. 27, lines 52-61, Cote et al.).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Tseng's patent with the teachings of Cote et al. by including additionally that each of the plurality of interconnect boards has an integrated circuit having first and second sets of configurable logic blocks and a data processing portion coupled to the first and second sets, wherein the data processing portion is configured to provide a first test pattern to the first set to test the second set and a second test pattern to the second set to test the first set.

This modification would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, because one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that it would provide the opportunity to verify interconnect boards including integrated circuits so that the signals can be routed correctly.

16. Claim 25 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tseng et al. (US 5,903,744) in view of Butts et al. (US 5,036,473) and Cote et al. (US 6,470,485 B1).

As per claim 25, Tseng et al. teach an emulation system, comprising: a plurality of emulation boards; and a plurality of interconnect boards interconnecting the plurality of emulation boards (fig. 1, col. 1, line 51-col. 2, line 16, Tseng et al.).

However Tseng et al. do not explicitly teach specifically that each of the plurality of interconnect boards has an integrated circuit having first and second routing portions, wherein the first routing portion is configured receive input data and to map N inputs of the first routing portion to N outputs of the first routing portion in a first manner, wherein the second routing portion is configured to map N inputs of the second routing portion to N outputs of the second routing portion in a second manner inverse to the first manner, and is configured to output data.

Butts et al. in an analogous art teach that logic chips...realized logic (col. 11, lines 46-50, Butts et al.).

Butts et al. also teach that route the interconnections...accomplish the interconnect (col. 12, lines 30-37, Butts et al.). Butts et al. teach that the channel-routing interconnect...alternating logic and routing chips (col. 13, lines 6-27, Butts et al.). Butts et al. also teach that an "interconnect chip" is an electronically

Art Unit: 2138

reconfigurable device which can implement arbitrary interconnections among its I/O pins. A "routing chip" is an interconnect chip used in a direct or channel-routing interconnect (col. 2, lines 15-19, Butts et al.).⁰⁶ Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Tseng's patent with the teachings of Butts et al. by including additionally that each of the plurality of interconnect boards has an integrated circuit having first and second routing portions, wherein the first routing portion is configured receive input data and to map N inputs of the first routing portion to N outputs of the first routing portion in a first manner, wherein the second routing portion is configured to map N inputs of the second routing portion to N outputs of the second routing portion in a second manner inverse to the first manner, and is configured to output data.

This modification would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, because one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that it would provide the opportunity to route signals in the interconnect boards so that the emulation boards can be interconnected.

Tseng et al. also do not explicitly teach specifically that the monitoring logic is configured to determining whether a difference exists between the input data and the output data.

However Cote et al. in an analogous art teaches that eight independent feedback paths...free of defects (fig. 3A, col. 19, lines 57-60, Cote et al.).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Tseng's patent with the teachings of Cote et al. by including additionally that the monitoring logic is configured to determining whether a difference exists between the input data and the output data.

This modification would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, because one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that it would provide the opportunity to find defects in the interconnect so that the signals can be routed correctly using a fault-free interconnect.

Art Unit: 2138


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dipakkumar Gandhi whose telephone number is 571-272-3822. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 AM - 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Albert Decady can be reached on (571) 272-3819. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



Dipakkumar Gandhi
Patent Examiner



ALBERT DECADY
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100